REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the present application.

INITIALLED PTO-1449 NEEDED

The Examiner is respectfully requested to initial and return the PTO-1449 submitted with the IDS filed on June 13, 2001.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 17-25, 28 and 33-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135) in view of Murphy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,110). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1, 18, 21 and 35, the Examiner alleges that Webb et al. teaches the feature of checking whether or not one or more processing devices are suitable for performing the defined job as required by the claims, because Webb et al. allegedly indicates whether or nor the printers are available. However, an indication of the *availability* of a printer is not equivalent to an indication of the *suitability* of a particularly defined job.

More specifically, Webb et al. discloses a printing system having multiple printers where at the site of a host computer, status information for indicating the status of the printers is displayed to the user. As such, Webb et al.'s system provides the ability for the user at the host to visually monitor the

status of the multiple printers at a given time by reviewing a list of printers that are available to the host. But, just because a printer is available does not render it suitable for performing a particular job.

For example, if the job requires the use of staples, but the printer has no stapling facility, then this printer is not suitable for performing this job even if the printer is available (all available functions of this printer are in good working order). Applicants' feature of automatically checking for each printer to see whether it is fit or suitable for processing the specified job is then completely absent from Webb et al. reference. Instead, in Webb et al., the user himself must select a particular printer to access its status information and must interpret by himself the status information that is displayed to determine whether or not this printer is *suitable* for performing the desired job.

In Applicants' embodied invention, the system automatically checks whether or not each of the processing devices is suitable for the specified job, i.e., is it capable of completing the specified job. This eliminates the need for the user to manually examine the status information of the printers to determine which printer will be suitable to complete the job and thus provides a great deal of convenience and ease of use to the user.

Moreover, Murphy et al. does not overcome this deficiency of Webb et al. since Murphy et al. is merely relied on for providing a certain device name communication from a client to a server.

Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo,* the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the feature of checking whether processing device(s) is suitable for performing the defined job, as required by each of the independent claims. Accordingly, the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 18, 21 and 35 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 26-27 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al. in view of Murphy et al., and further in view of Applicants' disclosed related art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the combination of Webb et al. and Murphy et al. does not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in independent claims 1 and 21 from which claims 5-7, 26-27 and 29 depend. Further, Applicants' disclosed related art does not overcome this deficiency in the applied references since Applicants' disclosed related art is merely relied on for providing an order for processing information.

Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo,* the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims 5-7, 26-27 and 29 (due to their dependency). Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-16 and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al. in view of Murphy et al. and further in view of Takeshita. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the combination of Webb et al. and Murphy et al. does not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in independent claims 1 and 21 from which claims 11-16 and 30-32 depend. Further, Takeshita does not overcome this deficiency in the applied references since Takeshita is merely relied on for teaching the selection criterion. Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims 11-16 and 30-32 (due to their dependency). Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the

undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of $110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Scott L. Lee #41,458
Raymond C. Stewart, #21,066

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

RCS/EHC:lmh